

Remark

The applicant is representing himself, and he came to this drastic situation after what he was going through with his patent attorneys scams in this invention.

The applicant is not a very good English Writer, and he is sorry if there are mistakes in this response.

Arguments

1. The applicant disagrees with the Examiner and the USPTO in the next points:
2. The applicant disagrees with the Examiner's decision to execute a FINAL OFFICE ACTION, and he asks him to cancel it due to the next raised points.
3. The applicant disagrees with the Examiner's determination, to continue with exactly the same arguments, raised by the previous Examiner, Mr. **Anthony Knight**, against the invention claims, without changing anything, in all these many years, in spite of the applicant's proofs of the unique differences between his invention and the cited inventions.
4. It is a fact that the applicant claims invention is being examined based on the **PCT written opinion** (from the date of **16 Jan 1997**).
5. This **written opinion** was maid by the previous Examiner, Mr. **Anthony Knight**.
6. This Examiner, was dismissed to continue to be the Examiner in this case, due to his illegal demands from the applicant, to agree to narrow his invention claims protection, by "inserting" a "preamble" to claim 1, that will contain a "closed list of products" and to "grant" by that a narrow patent protection to this invention.

7. The applicant claims, that from the beginning, the examiner's attitude in his examination was to narrow the applicant's invention protection claims.
8. The applicant claims, that these examination arguments are irrelevant, and their target is to waste the applicant's time invention - till 20 years of the invention life time will pass away.
9. The applicant claims, that his main invention target is to multiply movements of any starting movement being created by a human being or any other relevant object.
10. The applicant claims, that the structure techniques to do it, are described in his patent application invention, and no other cited invention is containing the full suitable system for it - like his invention.
11. It is unfair to put together inventions' parts combination of different inventions and to claim that:

"it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the device of Pipes as taught by Wilding for the purpose of maintaining consistent movement of product being conveyed" (and etc. in the other inventions that were cited in this examination against the invention)
13. And then, in the opposite, to admit in the examination, about all of these cited inventions, that they are not containing the full suitable structure techniques to do what the present invention does, such as:
14. **"pipes does not disclose that the motion is controllably reversible"** (and etc. in the other inventions that were cited in this examination against the invention)

15. the arguments that **"a person having ordinary skill in the art"** can create the applicants' invention from the parts combinations of the cited inventions is unfair, ridiculous and not realistic - based on the history of the human being historical technology development.

16. The applicant is going to prove now this argument:

17. In the past, the applicant worked with all kinds of machines and metal as an **engraver, on a lathe machine and as a metal fitter.**

18. In this kind of work the applicant had to create in his work all kinds of complicated machinery parts, made of metal and other materials, and all kinds of metal systems parts that had to work together as a machinery system.

19. At that time, the applicant lived in a very violent neighborhood, a downtown area in Haifa, near the port of Haifa. (Israel)

20. This violent neighborhood included many citizens with a profession like the applicant's profession then. (the applicant changed his profession later on, and his invention was created after he dreamed this invention in his dream, working then, as a musician and a song writer and as a music teacher)

21. Those citizens had families with children that were exposed every day to the violence that was in this neighborhood and in the streets.

22. Based on the Examiners' arguments' conclusions from the examination, the applicant is asking the Examiner the next question :

23. "why all of these **professionals, including the applicant then**, with the **"ordinary skill in the art"**, didn't think then (and till today) of this invention solution, which is giving a new tool, for any one, to defend

himself, by creating a wide distance from any attacker, and handle this violent situation with this product invention, by shocking the attacker an electrical shock, from a safe distance, and rescue he's life and/or he's children and family lives ?.

24. The applicant is asking the Examiner the next question:

25. Why, during thousands of years of technology development, and in all of the history development of war and fighting technology, no one thought and developed a simple tool like this invention to defend or attack his enemy?

26. The applicant is asking the Examiner the next question:

27. why hunters did not develop such a tool to catch animals? Or defend them selves from dangerous animals with a tool like this invention?

28. The applicant claims, that the most important field in the history of technological development of inventions, is the field of inventions that are saving people's life.

29. So, how come, no one, in the long history of invention developments, or any products developments, have created a tool like this invention?

30. how come, with all of the knowledge, and the know-how, of all kind of parts of mechanical systems, and parts combinations of all of those inventions, that was maid till now, no one, have created before this kind of combination parts to create an invention tool like this invention?

[REDACTED]

32. The applicant claims, that there is no such "person having ordinary skill in the art" that could think of his invention as the Examiners are claiming in their arguments.

All of the technological developments history proves it !!!

And now, I will write directly my arguments:

I would like, here and now, to try, with all of my modesty, and with my "broken" English ability, to put a border milestone, that will put a clear new criterion border line, to the use of the term "a person having ordinary skill in the art" against specific kind of inventions like my invention.

And here it is, as follow:

I claim that:

1. If a patent application, is a kind of application which contains a tool with the ability to save human being lives, and;
2. If this patent application, is a concept that it is possible to create from it all kinds of new tools, in many fields of working areas, and/or useful areas, and;
4. If this patent application, can change existing tools for the better, and;
5. If this patent application, has a wide commercial potential,

Then:

It is a sign and a prove that no other "person having ordinary skill in the Art" had the creativity, the combination ability, and the thought, to create this invention, before the inventor and his new invention, and;

With these results I suggest:

1. The argument of "a person having ordinary skill in the art" will not be argued against this kind of invention, and;
2. Any kind of a part, from one system cited invention, will not combined together with another part from another cited system invention, to argue with these combination parts inventions, against a new invention that answers the above criterions, and:
3. This kind of patent application will be considered as a new invention and will be granted with a patent.

~~A question that its aim is to stop the end of the invention from dominating the market with all of these many invention tools that can dominate the technology market and in the world~~

This is my suggestion.

Arguments continuation

The applicant' invention is not a "one product invention" like, for example a "dish washer".

The applicant' invention is a new "principle concept invention".

This concept is going to change lots of existing tools and products and create totally new products - based on his principle concept invention.

1. The applicant disagrees with the Examiner's decision to split his invention to species, in the way that it's accomplished and is still happening, by the current Examiner Mr. **John B. Walsh**, suddenly, After 12 years of examining his invention as one invention.
2. The applicant disagrees with so many "mistakes" in his case, made by already 4 Examiners - in these 12 years of proceedings.
3. The applicant disagrees with the results of the proceedings that have been made by his former patent attorney Mr. **Edward Langer** together with the former Examiner Mr. **Anthony Knight** against his rights and his invention.
4. The applicant disagrees with the results of the proceedings in this case in the **USPTO**.
5. The applicant disagrees with all the results of the proceedings in all of his patents and patent applications that he have lost because of this wrong and misleading proceedings in the **USPTO**, together and with his former American and Israeli patent attorneys.
6. The applicant will write a complaint of all these matters to the head of the **USPTO** Mr. **JON DUDAS**, in his official capacity as Under-Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
7. The applicant is considering joining the **Dr. Triantafyllos Tafas** lawsuit **CIVIL ACTION** against the **USPTO**, or to file a separate lawsuit against the **USPTO**, if the **USPTO** will not handle an investigation in his case and

repair all the loss and damages that have happened in the **USPTO** against his inventions and his rights.

8. The applicant is considering to file this lawsuit, together with other civilians, army solvers, police man, fire fighters and relatives of terror attacks victims (including victims of the 9/11) and human rights organizations, against the **USPTO**, for all these years of lost of lives, without using his inventions by the public, because of the USPTO approach to his inventions, and the wrong proceedings in the USPTO, that are preventing from him the right to have patents that will help him to produce all his products invention tools to help the public.

Questions to the Examiner and the **USPTO**:

1. In the past, the former Examiner Mr. **Anthony Knight**, agreed together with the former applicant patent attorney Mr. **Edward Langer**, in their meetings, that the invention will be granted with a patent, if the applicant will agree to add, a narrowing preamble to claim 1 and claim 50 to his patent claims, which will contain a closed list of products that the invention will cover.
 - A. What does it prove on the kind of "arguments" that Mr. **Anthony Knight**, the former Examiner, raised against the invention?
 - B. What does it prove if the same "arguments", are being used again, against the invention, already 4 years, by the present Examiner?
2. This "agreement" was canceled by them later,

A. Why these narrowing preamble in claim 1 and claim 50 have not been removed from the invention claims and way they are still a part of the invention claims?

B. if it was wrong by the former Examiner Mr. **Anthony Knight** to demand from the applicant to add narrowing preamble product list in claim 1 and claim 50,

Why is it right to leave them in the invention claims, for 4 years, till now?

And why is it right now to consider it as a right procedure and to end now this procedure by this final action decision maid by this present Examiner?

3. And why, in these **4 years of a procedure with him**, the present Examiner did not offer to the applicant to remove these narrowing preambles from claim 1?
4. And why the decision in the appeal application, about Examiner Knight behavior in this case, did not come to this conclusion in their decision?
5. Why it took **12 years of proceedings** to decide, **suddenly**, by the current Examiner Mr. **John B. Walsh**, that the invention is a **species invention, and to demand from the applicant to split his invention to species again, now, in his final action - after 12 years of proceedings exam - as one invention?**
6. How many years will it take to the Examiners in this case to grant a patent for this mechanic invention?
7. Are they willing to "kill" it with a long "proceedings" of 20 years?
8. If yes, they are almost there !!!

9. Why it is taking already 12 years, 4 Examiners, 12 years of exam - as one invention, and all kind of other "strange" "mistakes" and other "things" ?
10. Why the Examiner is demanding now with this "final action" to split the invention to species, which will take more years and more money from the applicant and will prevent him from manufacturing the important products to the public?
11. When the USPTO and the Examiner will "succeed" to grant a patent to this invention?
12. There is much "more" incidents in this "case" which the applicant will have to open in the court, if the right solution and investigation will not be decided by the USPTO in this case.

It took the applicant 12 years till he came to this decision to write this response in this kind of language.

Without respectful submission,

Mordechai Hammer, Inventor

Mordechai Hammer

P.O.Box 6749

Ramat - Gan 52167, ISRAEL

Fax: (Israel) 972-3-574-8867

Email: pat2pct@gmail.com

Cell: 972-50-769-3244



Claim 50 (previously added, currently amended).

A motion transmission and multiplication system for use with systems, devices ~~[[or]]~~ and structures that require movement of segments, to enable extendable and retractable motion, ~~such as to be used with~~ cleaning systems, measuring systems, hand-movable tools, music instruments and accessories, electrical and telecommunication devices, transportation and delivery systems, shades, sailing boats, chairs, tripods, tables and tents, said motion transmission and multiplication system comprising: at least first and second hand-movable elements each having anterior and posterior ends, said elements extending in the same orientation, each element having at least one point thereon connectable to a tool or other object; and at least a first means linking said first and second elements and being movable with respect to at least one of them, said first linking means also being connectable to an additional element, said first linking means being arranged on said elements such that when said first linking means is moved with a controllably reversible driving motion with respect to either of said anterior and posterior ends of a selected reference one of either of said first and second elements, wherein said driving motion is in a direction in-line with said orientation, then said first and second elements, and if connected, said additional element are simultaneously provided with a controllably reversible and multipliable, non gravity dependent, linear-to-linear driven motion with respect to each other in-line with said orientation, said driven motion being in the same direction as said driving motion, or reverse thereto, in accordance with which reference one of said first and second elements was selected in respect of said driving motion.